

Diff(Σ) and Metrics from Hamiltonian–TQFT’s in 2+1 Dimensions*

ROGER BROOKS

*Center for Theoretical Physics,
Laboratory for Nuclear Science
and Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT

The constraints of BF topological gauge theories are used to construct Hamiltonians which are anti-commutators of the BRST and anti-BRST operators. Such Hamiltonians are a signature of Topological Quantum Field Theories (TQFT’s). By construction, both classes of topological field theories share the same phase spaces and constraints. We find that, for 2+1 and 1+1 dimensional space-times foliated as $M = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$, a homomorphism exists between the constraint algebras of our TQFT and those of canonical gravity. The metrics on the two-dimensional hypersurfaces are also obtained.

CTP #2175

December 1992

hep-th/yymmnn

* This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U. S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under contract #DE-AC02-76ER03069.

A popular notion in the literature on quantum gravity is that of an unbroken phase of general covariance in which the expectation value of the metric is zero; *i.e.*, the metric is degenerate. Although string theory [1] has provided input into our comprehension of such a phase, a complete picture is far from emerging. Progress in this direction was made with the construction of a class of Topological Field Theories (TFT's) known as Topological Quantum Field Theories (TQFT's) [2]. These were originally intended to be used as a machinery for computing topological invariants. Crucial to these theories are topological/BRST symmetries which obviate dynamical degrees of freedom; indeed, the classical action is topological. Nevertheless, physicists have found these to be attractive as they are suggestive of the unbroken phase of general covariance. In fact, it was hoped that we might be able to liberate the metric via the breaking of these symmetries. However, on general grounds, it is not possible to either spontaneously or dynamically break these symmetries [3]. Evidently, in order to arrive at the desired result, either a new means of symmetry breaking must be found or we must alter our approach to TQFT's. We might search for a method for identifying the diffeomorphism invariance constraints of General Relativity (GR) in TQFT's. As there is no dynamical metric in TQFT's, it has thus far been unclear how to derive these constraints.

Almost in conjunction with the development of TQFT's, a different class of topological actions for gravity in low dimensions ($D = 2, 3$) have appeared in the literature [4-10]. These are complete theories of pure, low dimensional gravity; in both the broken and unbroken phases. They exist by virtue of the fact that gravity in low dimensions is non-dynamical. For example, the graviton and graviton-dilaton systems have no degrees of freedom in 2+1 and 1+1 dimensions, respectively. This second class of TFT's are known as BF topological gauge theories [11]. The B field is a Lagrange multiplier which forces the field strength, F , to vanish. When these theories are applied to gravity, F is identified with the Riemann curvature tensor. Hence the BF theories are not applicable as theories of gravity in four or higher dimensions. Since TQFT's are generically not as constrained as BF theories, they are better candidates for the unbroken phase of general covariance in higher dimensions. In this note, we will find that it is possible to exploit the successes of the BF gravity theories to obtain metrics and a representations of diffeomorphism

invariance in Hamiltonian-TQFT's. By “Hamiltonian-TQFT” we mean any theory whose Hamiltonian is an anti-commutator of BRST and anti-BRST operators. As this is known to be a signature only of TQFT's, we postulate the existence of TQFT actions from which our Hamiltonians may be derived. Thus, we will drop the prefix “Hamiltonian” in the following.

To be precise, for two and three dimensional manifolds $M = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$, we will build the Hamiltonians of TQFT's from the phase spaces of BF theories. By construction, the reduced phase spaces of the TQFT and BF theories will be the same. For 2+1 dimensions, the metric restricted to Σ will be identified through the solutions of the constraints of the TQFT. We will also obtain this metric via the identification of a homomorphism between the constraint algebra of the TQFT and that of GR.

Our construction of the Hamiltonian may be applied to arbitrary theories with first class, irreducible constraints, Ψ_α , defined on a phase space with coordinates (p, q) . Let the constraints be Grassmann even (generalization to Grassmann odd is immediate) and form a semi-simple Lie Algebra:

$$[\Psi_\alpha(x), \Psi_\beta(y)] = iC_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma \Psi_\gamma(x) \delta_\Sigma(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) . \quad (1)$$

Following BFV [13] quantization we extend the phase space to include a pair of Grassmann odd fields, the ghost $\eta^\alpha(x)$ and the anti-ghost $\bar{\eta}^\alpha(x)$ obeying the equal time anti-commutator

$$\{\bar{\eta}^\alpha(x), \eta_\beta(y)\} = \delta_\beta^\alpha \delta_\Sigma(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) . \quad (2)$$

Then the nilpotent BRST and anti-BRST charges are constructed as

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int_\Sigma (\eta^\alpha \Psi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\eta}^\alpha [\eta, \eta]_\alpha) , \\ \bar{Q} &= \int_\Sigma (\bar{\eta}^\alpha \Psi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \eta^\alpha [\bar{\eta}, \bar{\eta}]_\alpha) , \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for which

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^2 &= \bar{Q}^2 = 0 \ , \\
\{Q, \eta^\alpha\} &= -\frac{1}{2}[\eta, \eta]^\alpha \ , \\
\{Q, \bar{\eta}^\alpha\} &= \Psi^\alpha - [\eta, \bar{\eta}]^\alpha \ , \\
[Q, \Psi_\alpha] &= [\Psi, \eta]_\alpha \ , \\
\{\bar{Q}, \eta^\alpha\} &= \Psi^\alpha - [\bar{\eta}, \eta]^\alpha \ , \\
\{\bar{Q}, \bar{\eta}^\alpha\} &= -\frac{1}{2}[\bar{\eta}, \bar{\eta}]^\alpha \ , \\
\{\bar{Q}, \Psi_\alpha\} &= [\Psi, \bar{\eta}]_\alpha \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Now the Hamiltonians of TQFT's are given by [2]

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, \bar{Q}\} \ . \tag{5}$$

Postulating the existence of a TQFT for which the BRST and anti-BRST charges are as given in (3-4), we find that its Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} (\Psi^\alpha \Psi_\alpha - \Psi^\alpha [\bar{\eta}, \eta]_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\eta}, \eta]^2) \ . \tag{6}$$

This Hamiltonian was constructed starting from a phase space with coordinates (p, q) and extension $(p, q, \eta, \bar{\eta})$ along with a set of first class, irreducible constraints $\Psi_\alpha(p, q)$. Alternatively, we could have started by writing down H and then realizing that there existed a BRST charge for which $H \in \text{Im}(Q)$. In the latter case, we would then require that our physical states be in the Q -cohomology. Subsequently, we would arrive at a physical Hilbert space given by $\ker(\Psi_\alpha)$.

For the theory with Hamiltonian (EqH) to be correctly labelled a TQFT, its energy-momentum tensor should be Q -exact. The most direct way to check this is to construct the action. This is beyond the scope of this note. At this stage, it is more fruitful to check for a relations to canonical gravity. Let us now find a homomorphism between the constraints and $\text{Diff}(\Sigma)$.

Consider a orientable manifold, M , of dimension $D = n + 2$ with $n \geq 0$. Introduce a n -form $B^A = dx^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{a_n} B_{a_1, \dots, a_n}^A$ which is valued in a semi-simple Lie Group IG .

Introduce the gauge field $A_a{}^A$ with field-strength $F^A = dx^b \wedge dx^c F_{bc}{}^A$. The manifestly diffeomorphism invariant action constructed out of these forms is [12]

$$S = \frac{1}{2n!} \int_M \text{Tr}(B \wedge F) . \quad (7)$$

S is also invariant under the n -form symmetry $B \rightarrow B + D\Theta$, for some $\mathbb{G}$ -valued $(n-1)$ -form Θ . (D is the exterior covariant derivative). We immediately see that B acts as a Lagrange multiplier which imposes $F = 0$ as an equation of motion. On the other hand, the A equation of motion yields $DB = 0$. As we will canonically quantize S , let us take M to be of the form $M = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$. We then find the constraints

$$\mathcal{G} \equiv D^*B \approx 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P} \equiv F \approx 0 , \quad (8)$$

where $*$ is the Hodge star operator on Σ .

We now consider the algebra of these constraints. The canonical ETC between momenta and coordinates is given by

$$[*B_i{}^A(x), A^j{}_B(y)] = -i\delta_B{}^A \delta_i{}^j \delta_\Sigma(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) , \quad (9)$$

where i, j , etc. are indices restricted to the Σ hypersurface. The Hamiltonian density is a sum of the constraints, $\mathcal{H} = \text{Tr}(A_0 \mathcal{G} + {}^*B_0{}^{ij} \mathcal{P}_{ij})$. It is straightforward to show that the algebra of constraints is

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{G}_A(x), \mathcal{G}_B(y)] &= i f_{AB}{}^C \mathcal{G}_C(x) \delta_\Sigma(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) , \\ [\mathcal{G}_A(x), \mathcal{P}_{ijB}(y)] &= i f_{AB}{}^C \mathcal{P}_{ijC}(x) \delta_\Sigma(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) , \\ [\mathcal{P}_{ijA}(x), \mathcal{P}_{klB}(y)] &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Gauge transformations with smearing functions Λ^A are generated by $G[\Lambda] = -i \int_\Sigma \Lambda^A \mathcal{G}_A$. Likewise, the n -form symmetry is generated by $P[\Theta] = i \int_\Sigma \Theta^A \mathcal{P}_A$.

Now introduce a scalar function M and a vector field $\vec{M}$, then define the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}[\vec{M}] &= i \int d^{n+1}y M^i \text{Tr}({}^*B^j \mathcal{P}_{ij} + A_i \mathcal{G}) , \\ \mathbb{H}_\perp[M] &= i \int d^{n+1}y M \text{Tr}([{}^*B^i, {}^*B^j] \mathcal{P}_{ij}) , \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

These definitions are motivated by Ashtekar's [8] approach to non-perturbative quantum gravity. The algebra of these operators is found to be

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}], \mathbb{H}[\vec{N}]] &= \mathbb{H}[[\vec{M}, \vec{N}]] \quad , \\
[\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}], \mathbb{H}_\perp[N]] &= \mathbb{H}_\perp[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{M}}N] \quad , \\
[\mathbb{H}_\perp[M], \mathbb{H}_\perp[N]] &= -i \int d^{n+1}y (M \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_i N) \text{Tr}([[*B^i, *B^j], *B^k] \mathcal{P}_{jk}) \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

from the first line, we notice that $\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}]$ is a homomorphism from the $\text{Diff}(\Sigma)$ Lie algebra into the constraint algebra of the BF theory for *arbitrary* $\mathbf{IG}$. Although this set of three commutators does not close for general $\mathbf{IG}$, it is still first class. It is only known to be first class in GR for rank one groups; then the last term simplifies and the algebra closes but it is not a Lie Algebra. To be precise, for $\mathbf{IG} = SO(2, 1)$, we find the full algebra to be

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}], \mathbb{H}[\vec{N}]] &= \mathbb{H}[[\vec{M}, \vec{N}]] \quad , \\
[\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}], \mathbb{H}_\perp[N]] &= \mathbb{H}_\perp[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{M}}N] \quad , \\
[\mathbb{H}_\perp[M], \mathbb{H}_\perp[N]] &= \mathbb{H}[M \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_i N] + G[(N \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_i M) g^{ij} A_j] \quad , \\
[G[\Lambda], G[\Gamma]] &= G[[\Lambda, \Gamma]] \quad , \\
[G[\Lambda], \mathbb{H}[\vec{M}]] &= G[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{M}}\Lambda] \quad , \\
[G[\Lambda], \mathbb{H}_\perp[M]] &= 0 \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where we have identified the inverse metric on the hypersurface: $g^{ij} \equiv *B^i_A *B^j{}^A$. $*B^i_A$ is allowed to be degenerate as we did not introduce its inverse. These features are familiar from previous work in GR [8]. It has been shown [9] that for $D=3$, $\mathbb{H}[\vec{M}] \approx 0$ and $\mathcal{P} \approx 0$ and $\mathcal{G} \approx 0$ imply each other if $\det(g^{ij}) \neq 0$; *i.e.*, if g_{ij} is non-degenerate. Unlike GR, we realize that we could have identified the metric on Σ before working out the algebra (13). From eqn. (8), we see that the constraints may be solved by taking $*B_i{}^A$ to be the dreibein and $A_i{}^A$ to be the Lorentz spin-connection restricted to Σ . In particular, $\mathcal{G} \approx 0$, is the torsion free constraint familiar from [5].

In $D=3$, the constraints (8) are irreducible. Consequently, we can apply eqns. (3) – (6) without alteration. To be precise, we can now claim that for $D = 3$ and $\mathbf{IG} = SO(2, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \int_\Sigma \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2} D_i *B^i D_i *B^j + F_{ij} F^{ij} \right. \\
&\quad - D_i *B^i [\bar{\rho}, \rho] - \frac{1}{2} D_i *B^i [\bar{\xi}, \xi] \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} [\bar{\xi}, \xi]^2 + \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\rho}, \rho]^2 + \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\xi}, \xi] [\bar{\rho}, \rho] \right) \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

is the Hamiltonian of a TQFT whose constraints are homomorphic to $\text{Diff}(\Sigma)$ with the metric $g_{ij} = {}^*B_i^A {}^*B_{ja}$ on the hypersurfaces at fixed time. Here, in the notation of eqn. (6), $\eta^\alpha \in \{\xi^A, \rho^A\}$ with ξ^A being the Gauss law constraint ghost and ρ^A the flat-connection constraint ghost. The explicit form and action of Q are

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &= \int_{\Sigma} (\xi^A \mathcal{G}_A + \rho^A \mathcal{P}_A - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\xi}^A [\xi, \xi]_A - \bar{\rho}^A [\xi, \rho]_A) , \\
\{Q, \xi^A\} &= -\frac{1}{2} [\xi, \xi]^A , \\
\{Q, \bar{\xi}^A\} &= \mathcal{G}^A - [\bar{\xi}, \xi]^A - [\bar{\rho}, \rho]^A , \\
\{Q, \rho^A\} &= -[\xi, \rho]^A , \\
\{Q, \bar{\rho}^A\} &= \mathcal{P}^A - [\bar{\rho}, \xi]^A , \\
[Q, \mathcal{G}_A] &= [\mathcal{G}, \xi]_A + [\mathcal{P}, \rho]_A , \\
[Q, \mathcal{P}_A] &= [\mathcal{P}, \xi]_A , \\
[Q, {}^*B^{iA}] &= i[{}^*B^i, \xi]^A + iD^i \rho^A , \\
[Q, A^{iA}] &= iD^i \xi^A .
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

We note from that the last commutator that the gauge field does not transform via a shift as is the case with Topological Yang-Mills (TYM) [2]. In fact, the action of Q on A yields a Yang-Mills gauge transformation. Thus, although the Hamiltonian is from a TQFT it is unclear whether or not it is from a TYM theory.

The constraints in two dimensional space-time are different in character from those of higher dimensions. Since 2-forms do not exist on one-dimensional manifolds, there is no $\mathcal{P} \approx 0$ constraint. The only constraint is that of Gauss's Law, $\mathcal{G}^A = D_1 B^A \approx 0$, where B^A is now a 0-form. As in [7] we treat both Poincaré and (anti-)de Sitter gravity by taking $\mathbb{IG} = SO(1, 2)$ with arbitrary cosmological constant, λ , so that the $SO(1, 2)$ algebra is of the form $[P_a, P_b] = \lambda \epsilon_{ab} J$ and $[J, P_a] = \epsilon_{ab} P^b$. The extended phase space includes the ghost coordinates θ^a and ζ along with the anti-ghosts $\bar{\theta}^a$ and $\bar{\zeta}$. With these and $M = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$, the Hamiltonian of our TQFT reads

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1} (\lambda D_1 B^a D_1 B_a + D_1 B D_1 B + \lambda D_1 B^a (\bar{\zeta} \theta^b - \bar{\theta}^b \zeta) \epsilon_{ab} \\
&\quad - \lambda D_1 B \bar{\theta}^a \theta^b \epsilon_{ab} - \lambda \bar{\zeta} \zeta \bar{\theta}^a \theta_a + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \bar{\theta}^a \bar{\theta}^b \zeta_a \zeta_b) .
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In these 1+1 dimensional cases it is unclear how to identify the metrics.

In conclusion, we have found a way to identify the constraints and phase spaces of General Relativity in $2 + 1$ and $1 + 1$ dimensions with the constraints and phase spaces of theories whose Hamiltonian are of the TQFT form. Metrics on the two-dimensional hypersurfaces were also identified. The method combines the BFV quantization of constrained systems along with the BRST exactness of the Hamiltonians of TQFT's. It is expected that generalization to four dimensions is possible.

REFERENCES

1. D.J. Gross and P. F. Mende, *Phys. Lett.* **197B** (1987) 129; *Nucl. Phys.* **B303** (1988) 407.
2. E. Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **117** (1988) 353.
3. R. Brooks, *Nucl. Phys.* **B325** (1989) 481.
4. A. Achúcarro and P. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **180B** (1986) 89.
5. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B311** (1988) 46.
6. A.H. Chamseddine, *Phys. Lett.* **233B** (1989) 291; *Nucl. Phys.* **B346** (1990) 213.
7. A.H. Chamseddine and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett.* **228B** (1989) 75; *Nucl. Phys.* **B340** (1990) 595.
8. A. Ashtekar, *Non-perturbative Canonical Quantum Gravity*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991); C. Rovelli, *Class. Quan. Grav.* **8** (1991) 1613.
9. I. Bengtsson, *Phys. Lett.* **220B** (1989) 51.
10. A. Ashtekar and J.D. Romano, *Phys. Lett.* **229B** (1989) 56.
11. For a review see D. Birmingham, M. Blau, M. Rakowski and G. Thompson, *Phys. Rev.* **209** (1991) 129.
12. G. Horowitz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **125** (1989) 417.
13. I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Phys. Lett.* **69B** (1977) 309; I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, *Phys. Lett.* **128B** (1983) 303.